



Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 1032969-000001

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of) **MAIL STOP AMENDMENT**
Urban Lindh)
Application No.: 09/834,909) Group Art Unit: 2166
Filed: April 16, 2001) Examiner: Ali Mohammad
For: DISPLAY OF PATENT) Confirmation No.: 5416
INFORMATION)
)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated April 9, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 20, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, on the basis of the Grealish patent (US 6,711,715) in view of the Keith patent (US 6,629,097). Claims 2, 3, 7-9, 12, 14, 15 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, on the basis of these two patents in further view of the Unger et al patent (US 5,721,910).

In the Office Action, the Examiner continues to assert that the Grealish patent discloses most of the features recited in the claims. However, Applicant is still unable to ascertain how the reference is being interpreted relative to the claimed subject matter.

In the previous response, Applicant identified specific features recited in the claims, and questioned how the Grealish patent could be interpreted to disclose these features. See, for example, the discussion bridging pages 9 and 10 of the Amendment filed January 24, 2007. Despite Applicant's explicit request to identify